

**PATENT**  
Atty Docket No. 62319  
By Facsimile

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

Applicant(s): S. Abramson, et al.  
Serial No.: 10/007,103  
Filed: December 4, 2001  
For: Robotic Vacuum Cleaner

Group No. 3661  
Examiner: M. Marc  
Conf. No. 3555

Mail Stop Fee Amendments  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

**RESPONSE TO FIRST (NON-FINAL) OFFICE ACTION**  
**AND INTERVIEW SUMMARY**

Dear Sir:

This Paper is submitted in response to the First (Non-Final) Office Action of June 18, 2003.

Please charge any additional fees associated with this paper to Deposit Account No. 50-1662.

---

**CERTIFICATE OF MAILING**

I hereby certify that, on the date shown below, this correspondence is being

- ☒ deposited with the United States Postal Service in an envelope addressed to Commissioner for Patents, Mail Stop Fee Amendments, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

**MAILING**

- 37 C.F.R. §1.8**  
☒ as first class mail.

- 37 C.F.R. §1.10**  
☐ as "Express Mail Post Office to Addressee"  
EXPRESS MAIL NO.

**FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION**

- ☒ transmitted by facsimile (703) 305-3597 to the Patent and Trademark Office. \*

Gayle Canfield  
Name of Depositor

Gayle Canfield  
Signature

October 17, 2003  
Date

**PATENT**  
Atty Docket No. 62319  
By Facsimile

This paper is accompanied by a Petition For a One Month Extension of Time, to extend the period for response to the aforementioned First Office Action to October 18, 2003, and the requisite fee of \$110. This Petition Fee has been charged to Deposit Account No. 50-1662. As this First Office Action appears to be inadvertent, the Applicants respectfully request that this Petition Fee be credited back to Deposit Account No. 50-1662, if the aforementioned Deposit Account is charged for this paper.

#### **INTERVIEW SUMMARY**

The applicants thank the Supervisory Primary Examiner, Mr. William Cuchlinski, Jr. for the Telephonic Interview between himself and the undersigned attorney on October 9, 2002. In this Interview, it was explained that the Office Action of June 18, 2003 was inadvertent and a new Office Action or other paper would be issued in replacement. However, in order to prevent abandonment of the above-listed patent application, Mr. Cuchlinski requested that the undersigned attorney prepare a response to the Office Action of June 18, 2003. Accordingly, the applicants submit this paper with remarks responding to the Office Action of June 18, 2003. These remarks follow this Interview Summary.

#### **REMARKS**

Applicants submit the following remarks in Response to the First Office Action of June 18, 2003 (hereinafter, the "Office Action"). It is respectfully asserted that this Office Action was inadvertently issued and should be withdrawn, and a new First and Non-final Office Action or